DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 829 CS 505 314

AUTHOR Williams, M. Lee; Wiatrek, Deborah
TITLE An Analysis of the Communication Systems of Part and Full-Time Instructors in Community Colleges.
PUB DATE May 86
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (36th, Chicago, IL, May 27-29, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; *Full Time Faculty; Job Satisfaction; *Organizational Communication; *Part Time Faculty; Peer Relationship; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Patterns; Communication Strategies

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine the differences in the communication systems of part- and full-time faculty in community colleges, and, if the communication system of part-time college faculty is significantly different from that of full-time faculty, what can be done to improve communication with part-time faculty in community colleges. One hundred one part- and full-time speech and English instructors from three community colleges were surveyed, using packets containing four evaluation instruments. Seventy-two surveys were returned. Although previous non-empirical investigations of community college faculty have suggested an overall lack of communication between part-time and full-time faculty and between part-time faculty and administration, this study only partially supported that supposition. Results revealed that even though part-time faculty did not express significantly more overall information uncertainty than did full-time faculty, part-time faculty wanted much more face-to-face communication with other faculty members as well as more contact with their immediate supervisor. Eight suggestions for improving communication for part-time faculty based on the study are offered. Data tables and references are appended. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED270829

AN ANALYSIS OF THE COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS OF PART AND FULL-TIME INSTRUCTORS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

M. Lee Williams

Professor of Speech Communication
Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas

Deborah Wiatrek

M.A. in Speech Communication
Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Lee Williams

Deborah Wiatrek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505 314

Paper presented in the Instructional and Developmental Communication Division, International Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL, May, 1986.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS OF
PART AND FULL-TIME INSTRUCTORS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Abstract

Since almost all of the investigations exploring the problems of part and full-time teachers in two year community colleges are based on informal observations, the present study was designed to empirically analyze and systematically investigate communication in several community colleges. Results revealed that even though part-time instructors did not express significantly more overall information uncertainty than full-time instructors, part-time teachers needed more human messages such as how they were being evaluated and chances for advancement. Conversely, full-time faculty members needed more information regarding decision-making in the college, policies, and organizational activities. Part-time instructors did not receive much information from the grapevine and wanted much more face-to-face communication with other faculty members as well as more contact with their immediate supervisor. Full-time faculty felt they received too much information from the grapevine and wanted much more written communication (e.g., handbooks, newsletters, memos). Overall, part-time teachers were much less satisfied with the rewards they received from working at the college, their relationships with co-workers, their working conditions, and supervision they received. The study concluded with suggestions to improve communication with part-time instuctors.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS OF PART AND FULL-TIME INSTRUCTORS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Introduction

The two year community college is a distinctive American contribution to higher education. Although the two year college is primarily a twentieth century creation, the foundation for this educational institution was established in the later half of the nineteenth century when they were first contemplated as a way to alleviate overcrowding in the universities (Bogue, 1950). Over the years, however, two year colleges have evolved into organizations which are more committed to serving students and the community rather than relieving the load of university enrollment. The philosophy of the junior college is to offer a comprehensive curriculum, provide an open door policy which allows a wide diversity of students to enter, and offer community services (Monroe, 1972).

In an effort to establish a comprehensive curriculum for its students, two year colleges provide five major programs which exemplify the true functions of community colleges. These programs are: (1) the traditional transfer program which prepares students to pursue additional education at a four year college or university, (2) the general education program which gives students a well-rounded education considered complete in two years, (3) the vocational program which prepares students for specific jobs and skills, (4) the developmental program which takes students with a poor academic foundation and seeks to develop these skills, and (5) the community service program which offers credit and non-credit courses, workshops, seminars, and continuing educational classes. (Monroe, 1972).

These programs attract a variety of students and are responsible in part for the tremendous growth which community colleges have experienced. Two year colleges have grown from a total of 8 in 1900 to 1,231 in 1980 (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1982), and the diversification of programs enables the colleges to reach many students who hold full-time jobs. Since the community

college, as defined by its philosophy, wishes to allow every interested student the opportunity for further education, this variety of programs is essential. Also essential is the scheduling of classes at many hours and places outside the main campus in an attempt to reach as many students as possible (Guthrie-Morse, 1979, 1980).

The problem created by the diverse scheduling offered to students is finding faculty who are willing to work at various times and places as needed. This problem is a serious one, since the growth of community colleges appears to be linked to off-campus classes. Full-time faculty members do not have the time to teach these classes, since most maintain a teaching load of at least fifteen hours a semester. In addition to the teaching assignments, faculty members must also counsel and advise students since this is viewed as an essential in the career of a community college teacher. Because full-time teachers are working at full capacity, community colleges have increasingly begun to employ part-time teachers.

These part-time faculty members make themselves available when and where the students need them. Not only do part-time teachers provide an answer to the problem of scheduling but also they bring with them special working knowledge and first hand experience within their fields, since most of them hold full-time jobs in their areas of expertise (Anderson, 1975; Guthrie-Morse, 1979; Koltai, 1977). While this use of part-time teachers is most common in vocational and community service areas, part-time teachers are also essential in the more traditional programs if the school is to reach all possible students. In addition, economics plays a big part in the use of part-time teachers since they can be hired for less than full-time teachers responsible for an equivalent number of courses. Also, some part-time teachers like the appeal of being college faculty (Anderson, 1975), and money is of secondary importance to these teachers.

There has been considerable discussion in recent years about the role of part-time teachers in the community college, especially since 1977 when the number

of part-time teachers first exceeded the number of full-time teachers (Cottingham, Newman & Sims, 1981). This growing number of part-time teachers has become the subject of many articles addressing the problems faced at community colleges (Cottingham, Newman, & Sims, 1981; Pollock & Brueder, 1982; Smith, 1977). One problem of major concern is the lack of communication. Often part-time faculty are not invited to departmental meetings, either because they are not thought of or because of the feeling that they would not be able to attend or even want to attend (Bonham, 1982; Hammons, 1981; Pollock & Brueder, 1982). This lack of communication can have a major impact on the quality of instruction, since most instructional development begins through interaction among faculty members, department chairpersons, and administrators (Hoenninger & Black, 1978).

A second problem concerns the receiving of messages and information from administrators and supervisors. Part-time faculty often do not have special office space or a phone made available to them while they are on duty, making it difficult to leave messages for the part-time teacher (Anderson, 1975). Yet another problem deals with the the lack of orientation and in-service training. In most cases, part-time teachers in two year colleges are not required to attend these sessions since the feeling of the administration is that they would not want to come or would not be able to get away from their full-time jobs. Conversely, full-time teachers usually attend orientation and in-service meetings as well as have easier access to other faculty members and administrators. Part-time faculty members could benefit greatly from these meetings (McDougle, 1980; Wenrick & Eakin, 1979; Walker, 1980).

Because the part-time faculty are not involved in orientation and in-service training, they have many questions and problems that need attention. This would seem to be an easy problem to solve since every part-time faculty member has a supervisor to provide necessary information. Unfortunately, the supervisor is often not available to answer questions. Since part-time teachers have classes scheduled at irregular hours and are often not on the main campus, supervisors find it

difficult to see these teachers with any regularity (Lolley, 1980; Hammons, 1981). This lack of supervision is perpetuated by administrative policies toward the supervisors. Administrators do not always recognize these supervisors for their extra work, do not give them extra pay, and in most cases do not allow time off or lighter class loads for supervisors (Bonham, 1982; Hammons, 1981). When there is little information from meetings, orientation, or supervisor contact, there can be confusion and increased difficulty for the part-time teacher.

The two final problems faced by part-time teachers in two year community colleges deal with college policies. First is the limited information regarding the evaluation process used for part-time teachers. Most part-time faculty are not hired for a school year but on a semester-to-semester basis as needed. They are not under contract and have little job security. Even though they are hired on a semesterly basis, they are usually evaluated in the same manner as full-time faculty. Unfortunately, part-time faculty do not know when the evaluations will be done, and in most cases they are not informed beforehand of the criteria for evaluation (Cottingham, Newman & Sims, 1981; Guthrie-Morse, 1979; Hammons, 1981). Because of the problems the part-time teachers face in the evaluation process, they are unsure of themselves and may not try new or innovative teaching methods because of a fear of rejection or rebuke during the evaluation.

A final problem is the lack of a college-wide policy describing the responsibilities and competencies for part-time teachers. Without a description of duties and responsibilities, teachers do not know what is expected of them and cannot determine if they are working up to expectations. Since there is usually no written policy, they often get information by word of mouth. Many times they get conflicting information from different sources, primarily the grapevine (Hoenninger & Black, 1978; Haddad & Dickens, 1978). This problem, together with the problem of evaluation, creates a work climate characterized by ambiguity and confusion.

Surprisingly, almost all of the previously cited communication problems are based on informal observations and the individual experiences of community college

administrators. Few systematic, empirical analyses have been undertaken to substantiate these claims of communication problems between part-time and full-time faculty or between part-time teachers and the administration. In addition, there is no data on the differences between the communication systems of part and full-time faculty members. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to answer the following research questions:

> Research Question #1: What are the differences in the communication systems of part and full-time faculty in community colleges? More specifically, what are the differences in:
> (1) the types of information uncertainty (i.e., messages received)?
> (2) the channels of communication?
> (3) sources of communication?
> (4) satisfaction?
>
> Research Question #2: If there is evidence that the communication system of part-time faculty is significantly different from that of full-time faculty, what can be done to improve communication with part-time faculty in community colleges?

This study is of significance for three major reasons. Since very little empirical research has been conducted in this area, a data oriented investigation would be useful in confirming or clarifying the personal observations of those familiar with life in two year community colleges. The results would not only benefit those in community colleges but also be useful in the development of organizational communication theory. Secondly, this study is of importance since the future of two year community colleges seems to be greatly associated with the successful use of part-time teachers. Since the number of part-time faculty is on the increase, it is important to identify any communication problems which might exist so that the growth and quality of education experienced in the past will continue. Finally, this study is of significance since it has considerable pragmatic value. A better understanding of the communication systems of part-time and full-time teachers in community colleges will allow programs to be developed to remedy problems and create more understanding in the organization. Communication connects the interdependent units of the organization, and the discovery of communication problems can be instrumental in helping community colleges accomplish

their goals more effectively and efficiently.

Method

Subjects and Data Collection

After consulting with college administrators, permission was granted to survey part and full-time instructors in speech and English departments in two community colleges in San Antonio, Texas and one community college in Austin, Texas. Speech and English teachers were selected since they teach courses considered to be basic to a student's education and since they are an essential part of the transfer and general education programs. Only those instructors teaching the basic speech course or basic English composition courses were used in the study.

A roster of all the teachers in the speech and English departments at the three community colleges was obtained. Since the speech departments contained fewer faculty members, all speech instructors were selected for analysis. In the larger English departments, a random sample of approximately half of the part and full-time English instructors was drawn. In the latter part of the fall semester, one week prior to the date set for the data collection, a memorandum authorized by a college official was circulated to the faculty members in the speech and English departments selected for participation in the study. This memorandum informed the faculty of the analysis and assured them of confidentiality. A packet containing instructions and the communication scales was hand delivered to the full-time teachers in the three community colleges. Since many of the part-time instructors taught courses at satillite campuses and at irregular hours, the packet was mailed to all the part-time faculty. Prior to mailing, however, telephone contact was made with the part-time instructors. During the face-to-face delivery of the packet and the telephone conversation, individuals were encouraged to ask questions about the communication analysis or the instruments used in the study. A total of 101 packets were disseminated, with 58 to part-time teachers and 43 to full-time teachers. Respondents were encouraged to answer all items and return the packet of materials

within one week using the pre-addressed, stamped envelope provided.

Scales

Four instruments included in the survey questionnaire of the International Communication Association (ICA) Communication Audit were adapted for use in the present study. The ICA Communication Audit is an established organizational communication analysis procedure, and the instruments developed for use in the audit have high reliability and validity (Goldhaber, Yates, Porter, & Lesniak, 1978; Goldhaber & Rogers, 1979).

The Receiving Information Scale contained twenty-seven items and was broken down into four sub-scales (see Table 2). The Task Sub-Scale contained six items (1, 2, 5, 10, 13, and 17) and included issues such as "How to actually perform my job," and "The quality of work that is expected." Six items were included on the Human Sub-Scale (4, 14, 16, 20, 22, and 25). "Chances for advancement," and "Promotion and bonuses" are examples of human message items. The Maintenance Sub-Scale contained six items (7, 8, 11, 19, 23, and 27) and included issues such as "How organizational decisions are made that affect my job," and "Organizational lines of responsibility." Finally, the Other Sub-Scale contained nine items of specific interest to community college faculty members (3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24, and 26). Examples of these items are "Services such as typing and duplicating," and "How to counsel and advise students."

Using the method employed in the ICA Communication Audit, subjects were asked to indicate how much information they were presently receiving (i.e., the "now" score) for each of the twenty-seven items as well as how much information they needed to receive (i.e., the "need" score) for each of the twenty-seven items. A five point scale was used to assess how much information faculty members presently received and needed to receive. The five possible responses were: very little or no information (scored 1), little information (scored 2), some information (scored 3), much information (scored 4), and very much information (scored 5). An

information uncertainty score was computed by finding the difference between the now score and corresponding need score. The need score was recorded as a negative value so that a negative information uncertainty score indicated more information was needed on that topic while a positive information uncertainty score indicated that too much information was being received. An uncertainty score approaching zero indicated that teachers were getting an appropriate amount of information on that topic. The information uncertainty scores had a potential range from +4 to -4.

The second instrument was the Receiving From Channels Scale. Like the Receiving Information Scale, the channels instrument assessed how much information was presently received as well as needed to be received from eight communication channels (see Table 4). Those channels were: face-to-face contact between two people, informal face-to-face contact among more than two people, departmental faculty meetings, written memos and letters, telephone, bulletin board, newsletters, and handbooks. The same five point scale was used to determine how much information was received and needed to be received from each channel, and a channel uncertainty score was calculated for each channel by taking the difference between the now score and the need score. A negative channel uncertainty score indicated a desire for more information from the channel in question while a positive score indicated too much information from that channel. An uncertainty score approaching zero indicated that instructors were getting an appropriate amount of information through that channel.

The Receiving From Sources Scale asked respondents to indicate how much information they presently received and needed to receive from specific sources of information in the community college (see Table 5). The nine sources included on the scale were: full-time teachers in my own department, full-time teachers in other departments, part-time teachers in my own department, part-time teachers in other departments, my immediate supervisor, my department chairperson, administration, the grapevine, and students. As before, the five point scale

assessing how much information was received and needed from each source was used. A source uncertainty score was calculated for each source by taking the difference between the now score and need score. A negative uncertainty score indicated a desire for more information from the source in question, a positive uncertainty score indicated too much information was received from that source, and an uncertainty score approaching zero indicated teachers received an appropriate amount of information from that source.

The Satisfaction Scale was an adaptation of the Organizational Communicaton Relationships Scale used in the ICA Communication Audit and the Job Description Index (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). Respondents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement with twenty-six items (see Table 6). The possible responses were: strongly disagree (scored 1), disagree (scored 2,) neutral or does not apply (scored 3), agree (scored 4), and strongly agree (scored 5).

In addition to the overall satisfaction score, the scale was divided into five sub-scales. The Working Situation Sub-Scale contained five items (1, 6, 11, 16, and 21), the Co-Workers Sub-Scale contained six items (2, 7, 12, 17, 22, and 25), the Supervisors Sub-Scale contained five items (4, 9, 14, 19, and 24), the Organization Sub-Scale contained six items (3, 8, 13, 18, 23, and 26), and the Rewards Sub-Scale contained four items (5, 10, 15, and 20).

Finally, nine demographic variables were measured: sex, part or full-time status, length of employment, highest degree held, usual teaching load, attendance at orientation or in-service sessions, availability of office space, availability of campus mail box, and involvement in textbook selection.

Results

Response Rate

Of the 101 distributed packets, 41 part-time and 31 full-time teachers returned completed questionnaires. All of the speech instructors returned the scales while 64% of the instructors in the English departments responded. The response rate was

almost the same for full-time teachers (72%) and part-time teachers (71%). Approximately one-third of all the respondents were from speech departments and two-thirds from English departments. In total, the response rate was 71%.

Demographics

Overall, the results indicate some major differences between the part and full-time instructors analyzed in the present study. Approximately half of the full-time instructors were male, but 61% of the part-time instructors were female. Eighty-five percent of the part-time teachers had been with the college for six years or less, while about 35% of the full-time faculty had been with the college for that length of time. The majority of the full-time teachers (65%) had taught at the college for seven or more years, while only 15% of the part-time teachers had been with the college for that time period. Most of the teachers had obtained Master's degrees (93% for part-time and 87% for full-time), with 5% of the part-time teachers and 13% of the full-time instructors holding a Ph.D. Every teacher had a campus mail box, and all full-time faculty had office space; however, only 22% of the part-time instructors had office space. Ninety-three percent of the part-time instructors taught 3 to 9 hours, while 90% of the full-time instructors taught 10 or more hours. All of the full-time instructors and 73% of the part-time teachers had attended orientation or in-service sessions at the colleges. The majority of full-time instructors participated in text selection (74%) while only a few (17%) of the part-time teachers had input into textbook selection.

Reliability

Table 1 presents the reliabililty results for the Receiving Information Scale and the Satisfaction Scale. The majority of the overall scales and sub-scales have an alpha coefficient of .80 and above. These findings indicate that the scales are reliable and have a relatively high degree of consistency in measurement. Reliability results are not presented for the channels and sources scales since the unit of analysis for these instruments is the individual item instead of the overall scale.

Receiving Information Results

Tables 2 and 3 present the results for the Receiving Information Scale. Part-time faculty members expressed a moderate level of overall uncertainty, with the greatest uncertainty on the Human Sub-Scale and moderate uncertainty on the Task Sub-Scale and Maintanence Sub-Scale. The human items with the greatest uncertainty were "chances for advancement," "how I am being evaluated," "promotion and bonuses," and "how well I am doing my job." Task items with high uncertainty were "how to handle exceptions or non-routine matters," and "new ideas for my job." Maintenance items with high uncertainty were "how organizational decisions are made that affect my job" and "organizational reward system." While the Other Sub-Scale showed only slight uncertainty, several items on the scale showed high levels of uncertainty. Respondents expressed the greatest uncertainty for "how to counsel and advise students," "how students should be graded or evaluated," "preparing tests," and "how my job relates to the total operation of the college."

Full-time instructors also expressed a moderate level of overall uncertainty; however, they indicated the greatest uncertainty on the Maintenance Sub-Scale and only slight uncertainty on the Human Sub-Scale, Task Sub-Scale, and Other Sub-Scale. The maintenance items with the greatest uncertainty were "how organizational decisions are made that affect my job," the "organizational reward system," and "organizational successes and failures." "How to handle exceptions or non-routine matters" was the only task item showing high uncertainty, while "promotion and bonuses" was the only human item with high uncertainty. Items on the Other Sub-Scale showing high uncertainty were "how my job relates to the operation of the college" and "basic philosophy of the college." Full-time instructors indicated they were getting more information than they needed on "absence policies."

An analysis of the t -tests, which were computed to determine the greatest information uncertainty differences between part and full-time instructors,

indicated that overall part-time faculty did not exhibit significantly more information uncertainty. Results did reveal, however, that part-time teachers had significantly greater information uncertainty on human factors while there was a tendency for full-time instructors to have greater information uncertainty on maintenance factors. Part-time faculty had significantly more uncertainty on "chances for advancement" and "how I am being evaluated" while full-time instructors had significantly more uncertainty on "how organizational decisions are made that affect my job." Even though the results were not statistically significant, there was a tendency for part-time instructors to have more information uncertainty on "how well I am doing my job" and "how to counsel and advise students," while full-time teachers indicated more uncertainty on "organization successes and failures" and the "basic philosophy of the college."

In an effort to better understand if the information uncertainty results were a function of the lack of presently received information or a feeling of high need for information, post hoc analyses were performed. Using the now scores on the Receiving Information Scale, t -tests were calculated to determine if part and full-time teachers expressed differences. While there was not a significant difference on the overall now score, there was a significant difference on the Human Sub-Scale (t (70)=4.96, p <.01). Full-time faculty indicated they presently received significantly more human information than part-time faculty. More specifically, part-time instructors indicated they presently received less information on "chances for advancement," "promotion and bonuses," and "organizational benefits." In addition, there was a significant difference on the Maintenance Sub-Scale, with full-time faculty indicating they presently received more information (t (70)=2.01, p <.05). Also, part-time teachers received less information on "how to counsel and advise students" and "how students should be graded and evaluated."

Another post hoc analysis was conducted on the need scores of the Receiving

Information Scale to determine whether part and full-time instructors differed in their perceptions of how much information they needed to do their jobs. Results indicated a significant difference on the Maintenance Sub-Scale (t (70)=3.91, p <.01), with full-time teachers indicating a greater need for information than part-time instructors. More specifically, full-time faculty needed significantly more information on "organizational successes and failures," "how organizational decisions are made that affect my job," "organizational goals and objectives," "organizational lines of responsibility," and "organizational policies." In addition, full-time instructors indicated they needed significantly more information on the "basic philosophy of the college" and "promotion and bonuses."

Overall, these post hoc analyses indicate that even though full-time instructors are presently receiving more human and maintenance information, they also need more maintenance information. These results clarify the nature of the message uncertainty experienced by instructors. Part-time teachers experience uncertainty since they presently receive little human information, but full-time faculty experience uncertainty not so much from the lack of maintenance information but because of their greater perceived need for maintenance information.

Channels of Communication Results

Table 4 presents the results for the scale assessing the information received through various channels in the organization. For part-time instructors the channels with the greatest uncertainty were informal group meetings, departmental faculty meetings, and face-to-face between 2 people. While these findings indicate part-time faculty want more information through these "vocal" channels, Table 4 also indicates that they are receiving slightly more information than they want from written channels such as memos and letters, handbooks, and newsletters.

Low uncertainty scores indicated that full-time instructors received adequate information from most of the channels; however, they did indicate moderate uncertainty for information received through handbooks and newsletters. In contrast

to the findings for part-time faculty, full-time instructors desired more information from the written channels of communication.

An analysis of t -tests, computed to determine the greatest channel uncertainty differences between part and full-time instructors, indicated that part-time teachers needed significantly more information from informal group meetings, departmental faculty meetings, the telephone, and face-to-face communication between two people. Conversely, full-time faculty needed significantly more information from handbooks and newsletters. These results again demonstrate that part-time instructors want information from more personal and vocal channels while full-time faculty want more information from written channels.

To better understand these channel results, post hoc analyses of the channel now and need scores were conducted. Results revealed that full-time instructors presently received significantly more face-to-face communication (t (70) = 4.10, p <.01), more information from group meetings (t (70) = 5.48 p <.01), and more information from departmental faculty meetings (t (70) = 3.97, p <.01). Conversely, post hoc analyses of channel need scores indicated only one significant difference. Full-time instructors needed significantly more information via handbooks (t (70) = 2.23, p <.05). These findings are meaningful since they indicate that the differences in channel uncertainty scores between part and full-time teachers are more a function of the information presently being received through these channels than the perceived need for more information through these channels. Part-time instructors do not show a greater need for these channels, but channel uncertainty emerges due to the lack of information presently being received through the various channels.

Sources of Communication Results

Table 5 presents the results for the sources of information analysis. For part-time instructors the greatest source uncertainty was for "part-time teachers in my department," "my immediate supervisor," "my department chairman," and "full-time

teachers in my department." A quite different picture emerged for full-time faculty. They indicate the greatest source uncertainty for "administration," "part-time teachers in my own department," and "part-time teachers in other departments." In addition, they felt too much information was received through the grapevine.

t -test analyses of source uncertainty scores for part and full-time teachers indicated that part-time instructors expressed significantly more uncertainty for "full-time teachers in my own department" and "my immediate supervisor;" however, full-time teachers indicated they received significantly more information from the "grapevine" than part-time teachers.

Post hoc analyses of now and need source scores produced some interesting insights. Full-time instructors presently received significantly more information from the grapevine (t (70) = 3.54, p <.01), but there was no significant difference in terms of the need for information from the grapevine. In addition, full-time instructors indicated they presently received significantly more information than part-time instructors from full-time teachers in their own department (t (70) = 7.39, p <.01), full-time teachers in other departments (t (70) = 8.55, p <.01), their immediate supervisor (t (70) = 2.45, p <.05), and their department chairman (t (70) = 2.83, p <.01). Full-time faculty also indicated they needed significantly more information from full-time teachers in their own department (t (70) = 5.28, p <.01), full-time teachers in other departments (t (70) = 5.51, p <.01), and the administration (t (70) = 2.81, p <.01). Altogether, these results demonstrate that part-time instructors receive less information than full-time instructors from the grapevine, from faculty members inside and outside their own departments, and from their immediate supervisor and department chairman. Part-time instructors also express less need for information from faculty members inside their own department, outside their own department, and from the administration.

Satisfaction Results

Tables 6 and 7 display the satisfaction results. Overall, part-time teachers expressed significantly less satisfaction than full-time instructors (t (70) = 3.65, p <.01). In addition, part-time faculty indicated they were significantly less satisfied than full-time faculty on four of the five sub-scales (i.e., rewards, co-workers, working situations, and supervisors). In terms of the Rewards Sub-Scale, part-time instructors were less satisfied with their pay, organizational benefits, promotion and advancement opportunities, and training opportunities. Part-time teachers were significantly less satisfied with all six items on the Co-Workers Sub-Scale. They were more dissatisfied with the ease in getting to know co-workers, co-worker friendliness, co-workers respecting difference of opinion, cooperativeness and trust of co-workers, and their relationship with co-workers. On the Working Situation Sub-Scale, part-time instructors did not feel free to express their opinions concerning the job and did not feel free to make their own decisions about carrying out their job. Regarding the Supervisor Sub-Scale, part-time faculty felt dissatisfied with the praise received from supervisors for doing a good job.

Discussion

Prior non-empirical investigations of community colleges have suggested that there is an overall lack of communication between part-time and full-time faculty as well as between part-time faculty and administration (Bonham, 1982; Hammons, 1981; Hoenninger & Black, 1978). This lack of communication implies that information uncertainty is present for part-time teachers and that their uncertainty is greater than the uncertainty registered by full-time faculty members. The present study only partially supported this conjecture. While the overall uncertainty of part-time instructors was slightly greater than that of full-time faculty, it was not significantly higher. Part-time teachers did express significantly greater uncertainty for human information such as chances for advancement and how they were being evaluated; however, they did not differ significantly from full-time faculty

in terms of task information uncertainty or maintenance information (i.e., college policies) uncertainty.

There are several factors which explain these findings and which point to the fact that there are considerable organizational culture differences between part and full-time instructors. In recent years, some communication researchers have explored the concept of organizational culture in an effort to better understand the nature of organizational behavior in general and organizational communication in particular. According to this conceptualization, an organizational culture is based on the member's development of collectively held underlying logics and legends about the organization and the organization's identity (Kreps, 1983). In addition to helping the members interpret and respond to messages, the organizational culture makes life within the organization predictable for its members. People who are accepted into the organizational culture have a common language, value system, and vision of the future which enhances communication and cooperation among members as well as allows them to coordinate activities and create meaning (Kreps, 1983). In order to belong to the organizational culture, communication is essential (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1982).

Within the community college the full-time faculty members are indeed members of the culture as a result of their higher job involvement and communication. However, the part-time instructors, with their limited communication with other teachers and their outside interests, do not appear to have full membership in the culture. Because of their lack of involvement, the part-time teachers may not feel the same commitment to the college or feel they are entitled to all the information full-time teachers are given. This situation appears to be especially true in the running of the college (i.e., maintenance and policy information), which part-time instructors might consider to be outside their domain of concern.

Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1982) state that most people can be maximally involved in only one culture at a time. Since teaching in the community

college for part-time teachers is not their primary source of income nor their main source of self-actualization, and since most of them have other full-time jobs, they may feel a much stronger commitment to the organizational culture where they have full-time employment. Additionally, part-time instructors may not wish to gain full membership into the college culture, since that would necessitate the expense of considerable time and energy. Part-time teachers are much less involved in the community college culture, and they do not have the same information needs as full-time teachers; therefore, the overall information uncertainty level is not higher than that of full-time instructors.

The finding that part-time faculty felt greater human information uncertainty than full-time faculty confirms other research suggesting that part-time teachers in community colleges want more information about such human elements as advancement opportunites, promotion and bonuses, and evaluation processes (Anderson, 1975; Cottingham, Newman & Sims, 1981; Guthrie-Morse, 1979). This lack of communication directed toward personal concerns may cause considerable difficulty for community college administrators, since research shows that human information is essential to the performance of a good job and to the job satisfaction of employees (Goldhaber, 1983).

There are several explanations which would explain why part-time instructors did not differ significantly from full-time teachers in task information uncertainty. The first relates to the nature of the job. As professionals, the teachers, whether part or full-time, feel they already have the necessary task information to do the job well. Most of them feel they already know the information they are teaching, their teaching responsibilities, how to plan lessons, etc., and feel that such information from the college is either redundant or unnecessary. Their assumption is that since the college has hired them, the administration must feel they have the necessary qualifications to do the job without further information being provided. Additionally, part-time teachers may feel that if more

information were needed, or if they were not doing an adequate job, their supervisors would tell them. Since they are not told differently, the part-time instructors feel that they are receiving sufficient information (Lolley, 1980; Haddad & Dickens, 1978; Goldhaber, 1983).

Regarding the channels of communication, the present research revealed that part-time teachers received most of their information from written channels including memos and letters, newsletters, handbooks, and bulletin boards. This finding is not surprising since the literature suggests that due to the lack of contact with individual supervisors and other faculty members, part-time teachers must rely on written material for information rather than vocally transmitted information (Anderson, 1975; Koltai, 1977; Pollock & Brueder, 1982). Conversely, full-time faculty members relied more heavily on vocal channels such as formal and informal group meetings, conversations, and telephone calls for information, although they also stated that memos and letters were a major channel of communication. Since full-time instructors have more opportunities for two-way communcation and feedback, their communication should therefore be more enjoyable and characterized by greater communcation of meaning (Rogers & Agarwala-Rogers, 1976). Finally, results showed that part-time teachers indicated a greater need for more informaton from the more vocal channels of group meetings and face-to-face contact. This finding supports the research of Randolph (1978) and Randolph and Finch (1977) who found that when there are conditions of uncertainty, vocal channels are preferred to written channels. This vocal communication would provide the part-time teachers with a way to ask questions and receive immediate answers, as well as provide them with a sense of belonging to the deparment and faculty.

Findings for the sources of communication demonstrated that part-time instructors presently received most of their information from their immediate supervisor, which in most cases was the departmental chairman, and the least information from other faculty members. This again demonstrates the isolation of

part-time teachers and confirms Anderson's (1975) contention that part-time instructors feel cut off from the rest of the faculty and look at the normal exchange of information between colleagues as a rare oasis of pleasure. This feeling of isolation is exaggerated when the college sends part-time instructors out to remote locations to teach, further removing them from opportunities to interact with other faculty members. Also, part-time instructors have little incentive to stay on campus when they are not in class since many community colleges do not provide office or work space for them (Pollock & Brueder, 1982).

Even though most part-time faculty in the present study received most of their information from their immediate supervisor, the level of uncertainty was significantly greater than that for full-time faculty. In addition, their uncertainty score for use of the grapevine was significantly lower than that of full-time teachers. These results again demonstrate the minimal involvement of part-time instructors in the organizational culture. Not only do they need more information from individuals in the formal chain of command, but also they are removed from the informal, peer communication in the organization.

Regarding teacher satisfaction, the results showed that even though part-time instructors expressed moderate overall satisfaction, it was significantly lower than that of the full-time faculty. Furthermore, this significant difference appeared on four of the five satisfaction sub-scales. The sub-scale measuring rewards gained from the organization showed the largest statistical difference, and every item on the sub-scale was significantly lower for part-time instructors. These results are reasonable since part-time teachers are not paid on the same scale as full-time faculty and do not receive the same benefits as full-time teachers. This is one of the primary reasons part-time instructors are employed—they are more economical (Anderson, 1975). In addition, part-time teachers experience less satisfaction since they rarely receive praise or recognition from their immediate supervisor. Goldhaber (1983) reports that the most important predictor of job satisfaction is

the communication relationship between superior and suborinate, and part-time faculty express a greater need for communication with their immediate supervisor than do full-time faculty. The dissatisfaction of part-time teachers with the rewards gained from teaching at the community college can be explained by Herzberg's (1966) motivation-hygiene theory. Not only do part-time instructors fail to receive sufficient hygiene factors such as good pay, good relationships with co-workers, good communication, good supervision, and security, but also they fail to receive sufficient motivation factors such as recognition for a job well done, freedom to make decisions on what the courses should include and how they should be taught, and opportunities for advancement. Since full-time faculty receive more of the motivation as well as hygiene factors, they experience greater satisfaction.

Suggestions to Improve Part-Time Faculty Communication

This empirical analysis of part and full-time instructors in community colleges has produced a variety of findings. The following suggestions, designed to answer the second research question in the present study and hopefully improve communication at community college, focus specifically on what can be done to help the part-time faculty. These suggestions are a logical extension of this research.

1. Part-time teachers need more human messages dealing with how they are being evaluated (i.e., criteria for evaluation) and how well they are doing their job. They need to know when and how they will be evaluated, if students will evaluate them, and what documents must be prepared to show evidence of good teaching. Human messages appear to be needed much more than task or policy messages.

2. Special orientation sessions for part-time faculty should be developed to deal with areas of high uncertainty. Issues which should be covered include how to advise and counsel students, suggestions to improve grading, and procedures which can be used to develop tests. Part-time instructors also need to receive more information which shows them the relationship between their job and the mission of the community college as well as the differences between their responsibilities and those of full-time teachers. This information will put the part-time teachers' job into perspective and hopefully will avoid unrealistic expectations. The administration should clarify that the main reason part-time teachers receive less pay than the full-time faculty is due to reduced responsibilities, and these responsibilities should be idenified and explained.

3. Consideration should be given to rotating part-time teachers more frequently. Since opportunities for part-time faculty to be promoted are rare, these instructors need to be informed of this limitation and procedures established to determine how many years a part-time teacher can effectively teach and be satisfied.

4. Part-time teachers need regularly scheduled meetings with their immediate supervisor to clarify procedures, discuss progress, and provide a face-to-face contact with an official college representative. These meetings must be at fixed times and not spontaneous. In addition, the college administration should place the supervision of part-time faculty as a higher priority and give supervisors release time or compensation for providing this service.

5. While it is unlikely that part-time instructors can effectively be integrated into the organizational culture of the full-time faculty, efforts should be made to create a sub-culture of part-time teachers. Since scheduling is such a problem in community colleges, efforts to integrate part and full-time faculty will have limited success. However, if office or work space were made available for part-time instructors, a sense of community could possibly emerge among the part-time teachers. This does not necessarily mean each part-time teacher would have individual office space. A certain area on campus could be designated as a location where all part-time instructors could congregate, thus providing an opportunity for catharsis, discussion of problems in teaching, and social identification.

6. To assure that part-time teachers have an opportunity to interact with others in the college community, policies should be established which mandate that all part-time instructors teaching several courses or sections must teach at least one course on the main campus. This might mean that all full-time faculty would have to teach at least one course off-campus, but if part-time instructors are to become more involved in the organizational culture and avoid being treated as second-class citizens, they must become more involved in the collegial relationships.

7. In addition to the increased face-to-face and vocal interactions with part-time faculty members, community colleges should develop clearer written documents regarding such issues as evaluation procedures for part-time teachers, responsibilities, and methods to improve the evaluation of students. Such written documents will provide a permanent, visible source of information, and faculty supervisors should dedicate a portion of their time with each part-time teacher clarifying this information in an interpersonal setting.

8. More effort should be exhibited by community colleges to reward part-time instructors by formally recognizing their work. In the absence of higher salaries and promotion opportunities, recognition of work can do a great deal to improve morale and create a sense of belonging. In addition to increased recognition given by the immediate supervisor and full-time faculty, a column in the faculty newsletter or campus newspaper could be dedicated to part-time instructors. In addition, awards could be established for exceptional part-time teachers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1
Reliability of Scales

Scale		Alpha Coefficient
Receiving Information Scale (Overall)	Now:	.92
	Need:	.93
	Uncertainty:	.93
Receiving Information Sub-Scales		
Task Information	Now:	.79
	Need:	.84
	Uncertainty:	.87
Human Information	Now:	.77
	Need:	.82
	Uncertainty:	.80
Maintenance Information	Now:	.74
	Need:	.84
	Uncertainty:	.76
Other Information	Now:	.77
	Need:	.82
	Uncertainty:	.82
Satisfaction Scale (Overall)		.95
Satisfaction Sub-Scales		
Work		.80
Co-workers		.92
Organization		.85
Supervisor		.90
Rewards		.75

Table 2
Receiving Information Scale Items *

ITEM	PART-TIME			FULL-TIME			t values for
	Now	Need	Uncertainty	Now	Need	Uncertainty	Uncertainty
1. How to actually perform my job.	2.29 (1.23)	2.63 (1.14)	-0.34 (1.56)	2.36 (1.17)	2.19 (0.87)	0.16 (1.32)	1.45
2. New ideas for my job.	2.20 (1.05)	2.95 (1.09)	-0.76 (1.30)	2.65 (1.05)	3.00 (1.21)	-0.36 (1.50)	1.22
3. Services such as typing and duplicating.	3.22 (1.17)	3.20 (1.27)	0.02 (1.54)	3.68 (1.05)	3.65 (1.02)	0.03 (1.38)	0.02
4. Chances for advancement.	1.56 (0.67)	3.59 (1.20)	-2.02 (1.53)	3.10 (1.38)	3.45 (0.81)	-0.36 (1.58)	4.53 ***
5. The quality of the work expected.	2.63 (1.16)	3.22 (1.31)	-0.59 (1.88)	2.87 (1.02)	3.00 (1.06)	-0.13 (1.16)	1.08
6. Audio/visual materials.	3.17 (1.05)	3.34 (1.24)	-0.17 (1.63)	3.68 (1.25)	3.58 (0.67)	0.10 (1.22)	0.77
7. Organizational successes and failures.	2.39 (1.09)	2.49 (1.23)	-0.10 (1.95)	2.65 (0.88)	3.42 (0.81)	-0.77 (1.18)	-1.71
8. How organizational decisions are made that affect my job.	2.00 (1.00)	3.17 (1.16)	-1.17 (1.60)	2.42 (1.03)	4.39 (0.76)	-1.97 (1.40)	-2.21 ***

*Mean scores are provided for now, need, and uncertainty for each item. Standard deviation scores are in parentheses.

**$p < .05$

***$p < .01$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2 - continued

ITEM	PART-TIME Now	PART-TIME Need	PART-TIME Uncertainty	FULL-TIME Now	FULL-TIME Need	FULL-TIME Uncertainty	t values for Uncertainty
9. Basic philosophy of the college.	2.93 (1.13)	3.17 (1.28)	-0.24 (1.79)	2.90 (1.11)	3.84 (0.82)	-0.94 (1.44)	-1.77
10. My job responsibilities.	3.39 (1.05)	3.66 (1.26)	-0.27 (1.64)	3.23 (0.99)	3.45 (1.12)	-0.23 (1.61)	0.11
11. Organizational goals.	3.00 (1.25)	3.27 (1.10)	-0.27 (1.64)	3.29 (0.94)	3.87 (1.06)	-0.58 (1.15)	-0.90
12. How students should be graded.	2.54 (1.25)	3.34 (1.24)	-0.81 (1.66)	2.52 (1.15)	2.77 (1.26)	-0.26 (1.21)	1.55
13. How to handle exceptions or non routine matters.	2.29 (1.06)	3.56 (0.98)	-1.27 (1.38)	2.39 (1.09)	3.58 (1.03)	-1.19 (1.28)	0.24
14. Promotion and bonuses.	1.68 (0.88)	3.05 (1.12)	-1.37 (1.62)	2.77 (1.20)	3.84 (0.86)	-1.07 (1.55)	0.80
15. How my course should be organized into units.	2.68 (1.29)	2.90 (1.14)	-0.22 (1.68)	2.16 (1.16)	2.45 (1.09)	-0.29 (1.07)	-0.21
16. My salary or pay.	3.37 (1.02)	3.37 (1.36)	0.00 (1.53)	3.45 (1.06)	3.55 (0.96)	-0.10 (1.49)	-0.27
17. The goals of my job.	3.00 (1.18)	3.44 (1.36)	-0.44 (1.78)	3.16 (1.00)	3.32 (1.30)	-0.16 (1.27)	0.74
18. Absence policies.	3.68 (1.08)	3.12 (1.31)	0.56 (1.61)	3.84 (0.90)	3.00 (1.00)	0.84 (1.16)	0.81

Table 2 - continued

ITEM	PART-TIME Now	PART-TIME Need	PART-TIME Uncertainty	FULL-TIME Now	FULL-TIME Need	FULL-TIME Uncertainty	t values for Uncertainty
19. Organizational lines of responsibility.	2.95 (1.22)	2.95 (1.18)	0.00 (1.57)	3.16 (1.24)	3.58 (0.99)	-0.42 (1.65)	-1.10
20. How well I am doing my job.	2.34 (1.20)	3.66 (1.22)	-1.32 (1.72)	2.68 (1.25)	3.32 (0.98)	-0.65 (1.38)	1.78
21. Preparing tests.	1.88 (1.05)	2.78 (1.19)	-0.90 (1.26)	2.00 (1.10)	2.48 (1.18)	-0.48 (1.15)	1.45
22. Organizational benefits.	2.42 (1.00)	3.05 (1.32)	-0.63 (1.71)	3.45 (1.18)	3.55 (0.96)	-0.10 (1.36)	1.37
23. Organizational policies.	2.81 (1.21)	3.05 (1.38)	-0.24 (1.46)	3.29 (1.24)	3.74 (1.03)	-0.45 (1.75)	-0.55
24. How to counsel and advise students.	1.95 (0.92)	3.32 (1.17)	-1.37 (1.45)	2.52 (1.09)	3.23 (1.18)	-0.71 (1.42)	1.92
25. How I am being evaluated.	2.10 (1.04)	3.56 (1.31)	-1.46 (1.36)	3.00 (1.34)	3.55 (0.89)	-0.55 (1.57)	2.65 ***
26. How my job relates to the operation of the college.	1.98 (0.88)	2.73 (1.12)	-0.76 (1.18)	2.13 (1.09)	3.13 (0.92)	-1.00 (1.53)	-0.77
27. Organizational reward system.	1.63 (0.86)	2.98 (1.06)	-1.34 (1.37)	2.03 (1.20)	3.29 (1.07)	-1.26 (1.71)	0.23
Overall	2.52 (0.55)	3.17 (0.80)	-0.65 (0.98)	2.87 (0.69)	3.34 (0.49)	-0.48 (0.78)	0.79

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3
Receiving Information Sub-Scales *

SUB-SCALE	PART-TIME			FULL-TIME			t values for Uncertainty
	Now	Need	Uncertainty	Now	Need	Uncertainty	
Task (items 1,2,5,10,13,17)	2.63 (0.72)	3.24 (0.88)	-0.61 (1.24)	2.77 (0.83)	3.09 (0.85)	-0.32 (1.14)	1.03
Human (items 4,14,16,20, 22, 25)	2.24 (0.59)	3.38 (0.98)	-1.13 (1.18)	3.08 (0.83)	3.54 (0.53)	-0.47 (0.98)	2.55 **
Maintenance (items 7,8,11, 19,23,27)	2.46 (0.68)	2.98 (0.94)	-0.52 (1.12)	2.81 (0.76)	3.72 (0.51)	-0.91 (0.93)	-1.56
Other (items 3,6,9,12,15, 18,21,24,26)	2.67 (0.63)	3.10 (0.85)	-0.43 (1.07)	2.82 (0.71)	3.13 (0.56)	-0.30 (0.72)	0.58
Overall	2.52 (0.55)	3.17 (0.80)	-0.65 (0.98)	2.87 (0.69)	3.34 (0.49)	-0.48 (0.78)	0.79

*Mean scores are provided for now, need, and uncertainty for each sub-scale. Standard deviation scores are in parentheses.
**$p < .01$

Table 4
Receiving From Channels Scale *

CHANNEL	PART-TIME			FULL-TIME			t values for Uncertainty
	Now	Need	Uncertainty	Now	Need	Uncertainty	
1. Face to face (2 people)	2.36 (1.04)	3.07 (1.15)	-0.71 (1.21)	3.52 (1.34)	3.61 (1.33)	-0.10 (1.33)	2.04 **
2. Group meetings (informal)	1.85 (0.88)	2.88 (1.14)	-1.02 (1.33)	3.26 (1.29)	3.29 (1.27)	-0.03 (1.25)	3.21 ***
3. Departmental faculty meetings	1.83 (1.05)	2.83 (1.05)	-1.00 (1.45)	2.87 (1.18)	3.03 (1.25)	-0.16 (1.42)	2.46 **
4. Memos and letters	3.83 (1.09)	3.46 (1.31)	0.37 (1.41)	3.52 (1.31)	3.48 (1.24)	0.03 (1.47)	-0.98
5. Telephone	2.07 (1.17)	2.73 (1.29)	-0.66 (1.26)	2.45 (1.03)	2.52 (1.12)	-0.07 (1.21)	2.02 **
6. Bulletin board	2.46 (1.25)	2.49 (1.31)	-0.02 (1.29)	2.29 (0.97)	2.16 (1.04)	0.13 (1.09)	0.53
7. Newsletters	3.05 (1.14)	2.76 (1.28)	0.29 (1.10)	2.84 (1.07)	3.29 (1.10)	-0.45 (0.92)	-3.04 ***
8. Handbooks	3.02 (1.06)	2.68 (1.25)	0.34 (1.18)	2.65 (1.36)	3.32 (1.14)	-0.68 (1.11)	-3.73 ***

*Mean scores are provided for now, need, and uncertainty for each item. Standard deviation scores are in parentheses.
**$p < .05$
***$p < .01$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5
Receiving From Sources Scale *

SOURCE	PART-TIME			FULL-TIME			t values for
	Now	Need	Uncertainty	Now	Need	Uncertainty	Uncertainty
1. Full-time teachers in my own department.	1.98 (1.08)	2.59 (1.16)	-0.61 (1.07)	3.94 (1.15)	4.03 (1.14)	-0.10 (0.75)	2.28 **
2. Full-time teachers in other departments.	1.17 (0.38)	1.59 (0.81)	-0.42 (0.77)	2.61 (0.99)	2.81 (1.08)	-0.19 (1.11)	1.00
3. Part-time teachers in my own department.	1.68 (0.88)	2.51 (1.25)	-0.83 (1.02)	1.87 (1.12)	2.61 (1.23)	-0.74 (1.03)	0.36
4. Part-time teachers in other departments.	1.29 (0.75)	1.73 (1.03)	-0.44 (0.84)	1.19 (0.75)	1.90 (1.04)	-0.71 (0.86)	-1.34
5. My immediate supervisor.	3.00 (1.16)	3.78 (1.01)	-0.78 (1.04)	3.61 (0.88)	3.84 (1.04)	-0.23 (1.33)	1.99 **
6. My department chairman.	2.98 (1.11)	3.73 (0.81)	-0.76 (1.07)	3.71 (1.07)	4.07 (0.96)	-0.36 (1.08)	1.57
7. Administration	2.63 (0.99)	3.17 (1.02)	-0.54 (1.14)	2.87 (1.18)	3.84 (0.97)	-0.97 (1.58)	-1.34
8. Grapevine	2.32 (1.17)	2.24 (1.14)	0.07 (1.15)	3.29 (1.13)	2.42 (1.23)	0.87 (1.82)	2.27 **
9. Students	2.44 (1.03)	2.54 (1.03)	-0.10 (0.66)	2.68 (1.25)	2.84 (1.34)	-0.16 (1.13)	-0.30

*Mean scores are provided for now, need, and uncertainty for each item. Standard deviation scores are in parentheses.
**$p < .05$

Table 6
Satisfaction Scale Items *

ITEM	PART-TIME	FULL-TIME	t values
1. The working conditions are good.	3.61 (1.14)	3.87 (0.96)	1.03
2. My co-workers are easy to get to know.	2.68 (1.25)	4.39 (0.80)	6.61***
3. My organization rewards competent performance.	2.32 (1.11)	2.39 (1.12)	0.27
4. I trust my immediate supervisor.	3.76 (0.86)	3.84 (1.19)	0.34
5. My salary or pay is good.	2.63 (1.07)	3.16 (1.21)	1.96**
6. My job duties are what I expected.	3.73 (1.05)	3.94 (0.85)	0.88
7. My co-workers are friendly.	3.32 (1.21)	4.32 (0.70)	4.12***
8. Compared to other organizations I like the way things are done here.	2.93 (1.03)	3.23 (1.23)	1.12
9. I can tell my immediate supervisor when things are going wrong.	3.54 (1.14)	4.00 (1.10)	1.73
10. Organizational benefits are good.	2.22 (1.04)	3.90 (0.83)	7.41***
11. I feel free to express my opinion concerning my job.	3.15 (1.17)	3.74 (1.21)	2.10**
12. My co-workers respect differences of opinion.	3.02 (1.04)	3.84 (1.04)	3.20**
13. The organizational rules and procedures are clear and easy to understand.	3.29 (1.15)	2.94 (1.15)	-1.31

*Mean scores are provided for each item. Standard deviation scores are in parentheses.
**$p < .05$
***$p < .01$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6 - continued

ITEM	PART-TIME	FULL-TIME	t values
14. My relationship with my immediate supervisor is satisfying.	3.56 (0.92)	4.00 (1.16)	1.79
15. Promotion and advancement opportunities are good.	2.05 (0.97)	3.23 (0.99)	5.04***
16. I feel free to make my own decisions about carrying out my job.	3.54 (1.27)	4.23 (0.81)	2.65***
17. My co-workers are co-operative.	3.32 (1.13)	4.32 (0.65)	4.43***
18. Red tape is kept to a minimum.	3.15 (1.13)	3.03 (1.17)	-0.42
19. My immediate supervisor is friendly with subordinates.	3.59 (1.00)	3.97 (1.11)	1.53
20. Training opportunities or courses are available.	2.95 (1.05)	4.00 (0.68)	4.84***
21. My job duties are clearly defined.	3.22 (1.04)	3.65 (0.88)	1.84
22. I trust my co-workers.	3.17 (0.95)	3.90 (0.87)	3.37***
23. My organization is concerned with its members' welfare.	2.71 (1.01)	2.84 (1.21)	0.30
24. My immediate supervisor praises me for a good job.	3.10 (1.18)	3.87 (1.09)	2.85***
25. My relationship with co-workers is satisfying.	2.85 (1.04)	4.32 (0.79)	6.56***
26. I am satisfied with the way decisions are made in this organization.	2.61 (1.02)	2.42 (1.23)	-0.72
Overall	3.08 (0.72)	3.67 (0.62)	3.65***

Table 7
Satisfaction Sub-Scales *

SUB-SCALE	PART-TIME	FULL-TIME	t values
Working Conditions (Items 1, 6, 11, 16, 21)	3.45 (0.87)	3.88 (0.65)	2.34 **
Co-workers (Items 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 25)	3.06 (0.93)	4.18 (0.59)	5.90 ***
Organization (Items 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 26)	2.83 (0.84)	2.81 (0.89)	-0.13
Supervisors (Items 4, 9, 14, 19, 24)	3.51 (0.85)	3.94 (0.99)	1.98 **
Rewards (Items 5, 10, 15, 20)	2.46 (0.68)	3.37 (0.68)	6.90 ***
Overall	3.08 (0.72)	3.67 (0.62)	3.65 ***

*Mean scores are provided for each sub-scale. Standard deviation scores are in parentheses.
**p <.05
***p <.01

BEST COPY AVAILABLE
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1982). 1982 community, junior, and technical college directory. Washington, D. C.

Anderson, R. B. (1975). Adjunct faculty deserves a better deal. Change, 7 (7), 8; 64.

Bogue, J. P. (1950). The community college. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bonham, G. (1982). Part-time faculty: A mixed blessing. Change, 14 (3) 10-11.

Cottingham, W. T., Newman, M. F., & Sims, D. M. (1981). Is there practical help for the part-time faculty, our new and neglected majority? Community College Review, 9 (1), 12-17.

Goldhaber, G. M. (1983). Organizational communication (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown Company.

Goldhaber, G. M., & Rogers, D. F. (1979). Auditing organizational communication systems: The ICA communication audit. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Goldhaber, G. M., Yates, M. P., Porter, D. F., & Lesniak, R. (1978). Organizational communication: State of the art. Human Communication Research, 5, 76-96.

Guthrie-Morse, B. (1979). The utilization of part-time faculty. Community College Frontiers, 7 (3), 8-17.

Guthrie-Morse, B. (1980). Agenda for the 80's: Community college organizational reform. Community College Frontiers, 8 (2), 38-43.

Haddad, M., & Dickens, M. E. (1978). Competencies for part-time faculty: The first step. Community and Junior College Journal, 49 (3), 22-24.

Hammons, J. O. (1981). Adjunct faculty: Another look. Community College Frontiers, 9 (2), 46-53.

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. Cleveland, OH: World Publishing Company.

Hoenninger, R., & Black, R. A. (1978). Neglect of a species. Community and Junior College Journal, 49 (3), 25-27.

Koltai, L. (1977). King solomon and the bowl of spaghetti. Community and Junior College Journal, 48 (2), 18-20.

Kreps, G. L. (1983, August). Organizational communication and organizational culture: A Weickian perspective. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Dallas, TX.

Lolley, J. L. (1980). A comparison of the use of instructional resources by full-time and part-time teachers. Community and Junior College Research Quarterly, 5, 47-51.

McDougle, L. G. (1980). Orientation program for part-time faculty members. Community College Review, 8 (2), 20-23.

Monroe, C. R. (1972). Profiles of the community college. Washington, D. C.: Jossey-Bass.

Pacanowsky, M. E., & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1982). Communicaion and organizational culture. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46, 115-130.

Pollock, A., & Brueder, R. L. (1982). The eighties and part-time faculty. Community College Review, 9 (4), 58-62.

Randolph, W. (1978). Organizational technology and the media and purpose dimensions of organizational communication. Journal of Business Research, 6, 237-259.

Randolph, W., & Finch, F. (1977). The relationship between organizational technology and the direction and frequency dimensions of task communication. Human Relations, 30, 1131-1145.

Rogers, E. M., & Agarwala-Rogers, R. (1976). Communication in organizations. New York: Collier MacMillian Publishers.

Smith, R. R. (1977). Developmental needs of community college adjunct faculty. Community and Junior College Research Quarterly, 2, 31-39.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, B. M., & Hulin, C. I. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago, IL: Rand MacNally.

Walker, M. (1980). Part-time faculty are unique. Los Angeles, CA: Univerisity of California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 191 531).

Wenrick. J. W., & Eakin, J. D. (1979). Faculty orientation in community colleges. Community College Review, 6 (2), 8-13.